

Inclusive education of gifted students at secondary schools in the Czech Republic compared to students with special educational needs

Citation

KLIMECKÁ, Eva. Inclusive education of gifted students at secondary schools in the Czech Republic compared to students with special educational needs. *Roeper Review* [online]. vol. 45, iss. 1, Routledge, 2023, p. 37 - 49 [cit. 2023-03-06]. ISSN 0278-3193. Available at <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02783193.2022.2145398>

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2022.2145398>

Permanent link

<https://publikace.k.utb.cz/handle/10563/1011388>

This document is the Accepted Manuscript version of the article that can be shared via institutional repository.

Inclusive Education of Gifted Students at Secondary Schools in the Czech Republic Compared to Students with Special Educational Needs

Eva Klimecká

Abstract: The research is focused on a comparison of the declared importance of fulfilling selected criteria of inclusive education between gifted students and students with special educational needs (SENs). Using the P-KAP II questionnaire, data were obtained from 541 secondary general schools (SGS) and secondary technical schools (STS). We found that in relation to students with SENs, schools declare a great interest in the issue of inclusive education, but in the context of gifted students a significant decrease in interest was declared. The results show a low declared need for schools to deal conceptually with inclusive education, especially focused on gifted education. Schools prefer rather informal inclusive pedagogical practices and cooperation with external counseling services. SGS schools declared a significantly higher importance of all criteria of inclusive education than do STS schools.

Keywords: Inclusive education, gifted student, student with special educational needs (SENs), secondary schools, quantitative research.

Introduction

Gifted students are characterized by specific manifestations in the area of cognitive, such as high intelligence and creativity, abstract thinking, excellent memory, and good knowledge

transfer, and in the area of socio-emotional, such as the intensity of experience and hypersensitivity, asynchronous personality development, and perfectionism (Van-Tassel Baska & Baska, 2019). Although gifted students are generally not included in the school legislation of individual countries as a group of students with specific educational needs (Kryszewska, 2017; Montgomery, 2015), it is generally considered that they require a specific educational approach to develop their potential (Syafri et al., 2020; Tomlinson, 2013).

Each student's entitlement to conditions enabling the maximum development of his/her talents is enshrined in key transnational legislative documents, such as The Dakar Framework for Action (UNESCO, 2020) or Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNICEF, 1990). Inclusive education is one of the key concepts in achieving equity and social justice in education for all children and youth. (Tirri & Laine, 2017).

The General Concept of Inclusive Education

The inclusive education that affects the reality of today's schools has become apparent worldwide in the last three decades since the 1994 Salamanca conference (Salamanca Statement, 1994). Support for inclusive education was also later confirmed by The Dakar Framework for Action (UNESCO, 2000). Since this time, many definitions of inclusive education have been formulated and many efforts to effect fundamental changes to the structures and practices of education have been undertaken.

Inclusive education has developed from the concept of integration (Farrel & Ainscow, 2002). Donnelly & Watkins (2012) argued that the aim of integration is to incorporate a student with special educational needs (i.e. a student with SENs) into the mainstream, with a primary focus on the learner's disability or his/her differences. However, integration has often been connected with disability and special needs education (Tirri & Laine, 2017).

The aim of inclusion is then to enable the student (with some differences) to be a natural part of the community from which everyone benefits (Winzer, 2009). Inclusion does not separate individuals according to their handicap or talent; it focuses on the needs of all students in the sense of “school for all”, where all students have the right to the maximum development of their abilities and skills (Tirri & Laine, 2017). This is the so-called broad concept of inclusion which is theoretically accepted by all UNESCO countries where inclusion is a universal human right (UNESCO, 2009).

The concept of inclusive education is evolving from country to country in relation to approaches to inclusion. Approaches can be identified by frontier poles from the concept of integration to the concept of inclusion. The integration is the provision of primary care for children with specific educational needs, which is often associated with “developing countries” (Eleweke & Rodda, 2002). The inclusion is associated with the countries of The Group of Twenty (Wang, 2014) or Scandinavian countries (Jahnukainen, 2015).

Inclusive Education in the Czech Republic

In recent years, the Czech Republic has also been striving to introduce elements of inclusive education into school practice. The key legislative documents of the White Paper (MŠMT, 2001) and the Education Act (MŠMT, 2004) highlight the need to respect the principles of inclusive education. An amendment of the Education Act effective since September 2016 guarantees the right for children to so-called “supportive measures” (MŠMT, 2016c). These measures should fit the particular needs of children or students with SENs, i.e. students with a chronic health condition, physical handicap, or social disadvantage (MŠMT, 2016c), as well as gifted students.

Inclusive education also ranks among the priorities of the document Strategy for Education Policy of the Czech Republic until 2020 (MŠMT, 2016a). In connection with the

expiration of this document and the finalization of the document Strategy for Education Policy of the Czech Republic 2030+ (MŠMT, 2020), it is necessary to monitor and evaluate the changes which are related to the implementation of inclusion in practice since 2016.

Due to the relatively short time since the mandatory introduction of inclusive education into practice, quality monitoring occurs at the level of internal evaluation of the school within the School Educational Programs (NUV, 2015). It is the responsibility of individual schools to produce evaluation reports, which are further processed at the regional or national level. It is also through the participation of schools in the national research surveys APIV-A, KIPR, P-KAP (see NUV, 2020) that schools are evaluated in terms of the quality of their inclusive education programs as well as through the compulsory participation of schools in an evaluation process conducted by the Czech School Inspectorate. Based on these surveys and other available resources (Balaban Cakirpaloglu et al., 2019; ČŠI, 2017; ČŠI, 2018; ČŠI, 2019; Michalík et al., 2018; OSF, 2017), the following general determinations regarding the current state of inclusive education in the Czech Republic have been made: the poor readiness of teachers for inclusive education, poor learning outcomes of socially disadvantaged students, lack of suitable candidates or lack of funding for teaching positions within school counseling services, high number of students in the class, inclusion seen as an administrative burden for teachers, an increasing number of students with SENs and a reduction in the number of specialized schools for students with SENs.

Gifted Students within Inclusive Education in Secondary Schools

The education of gifted children, pupils, and students ranks among the top 15 priority education concerns in the Czech Republic (NIDV, 2019). Although the Czech Republic has a long tradition in the development of care for gifted individuals, the elaborated legislative anchoring of the issue in school documents gradually began to be enforced only in 2004. The

Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport approved the Conception of Gifted Student Education within Education Counseling Services during the period 2004 – 2008 (IPPP, 2004), wherein the inclusive education is the main concept of pedagogical work with gifted individuals.

Concept of Giftedness

According to the Framework Educational Program for General Secondary Education (VUP, 2007), a gifted student is defined as

a student who manifests an exceptionally high level of performance within a narrow area or across the entire spectrum of human activities. An exceptional talent is manifested by an accelerated development in the activities in which the student demonstrates exceptional abilities, or by a high level of results in these activities. An individual can have one but also several types of talents; on the other hand, it is possible that the performance of an exceptionally gifted student will be average or below average in other activities.

The concept of giftedness defined above emphasizes the performance component of giftedness and exceptionality, thus tending towards a traditional perception of giftedness. Carman (2013), McBee & Makel (2019) claim that in the context of inclusive education concepts of giftedness range from traditional to modern concepts, ie. from conservatism to liberalism (from 2% to 20% of gifted in the population), from cognitivism to sociocultural concept, from quantitative to qualitative differences, from “being gifted” to “becoming gifted,” as well as from unidimensionality to multidimensionality.

The already theoretically defined traditional concept of giftedness does not create suitable conditions for quality inclusive education. This traditional concept could create negative teacher’s attitudes towards giftedness (Perkovic Krijan & Boric, 2014; Gagné, 2018), which can either lead to the elitism of gifted individuals (Delisle, 2001) or marginalization of

their educational needs (Gagné, 2018). However, the preference of the traditional concepts of giftedness is commonly described in studies from other countries (Altintas & Ilgun, 2016; Miller, 2009; Olthouse, 2014;).

Counseling Services for Gifted Students

An extensive system of counseling services for students with SENs has been created in the Czech Republic (NUV, 2016). It is the duty of each school to set up what is known as school counselling services which provide counseling to students, teachers, and parents. In relation to the issue of giftedness, these services deal with the creation of an internal concept of care for gifted students within a particular school. In recent years, schools have been developing the specific job position of School Counselor for Gifted Students. This professional is responsible for the official school concept of giftedness.

At the regional level in the Czech Republic, comprehensive educational-psychological services are provided by the Education counseling services (ECS). These external subjects of the schools are responsible for the official diagnosis and intervention of gifted students, as well as students with SENs. Based on the output of in-depth pedagogical-psychological diagnostics conducted by the national Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, the gifted student (and also a student with SENs) is placed into one of 4 levels within a system of “supportive measures” which define the quality and quantity of curriculum modification (MŠMT, 2016c). ECS, therefore, preserves the only form of identification for these students to which formal intervention in schools can be built on.

According to the Czech School Inspectorate (ČŠI, 2019), only 0.1% of all pupils and students in the Czech Republic were identified as gifted by ECS in 2019, with this number stable since 2014. Current numbers of gifted students exclusively in secondary education are

not available on the website. However, there is an assumption that this is a significantly lower number, as ECS services are sought after by parents of younger children (ČŠI, 2019).

If we compare the official numbers of gifted pupils with numbers of students with SENs (both diagnosed by ECS), in 2019, almost 13% of all elementary school pupils were registered as pupils with SENs, with this number increasing rapidly in recent years (ČŠI, 2019). For example, in 2015 there were only 8.9% of pupils with SENs in elementary schools, and approximately only half this number of students (4.7%) were studying at all secondary schools, also including specialized practical schools (ČŠI, 2015). In 2017, 6% of students with SENs were studying at secondary schools (ČŠI, 2018). The reduction in the number of students with SENs (as also gifted students) from elementary to secondary school stems from the absence of subsequent formal diagnosis and intervention in ECS. This reduction is more due to the lack of interest of students and their families in formal institutional care (ČŠI, 2019).

The modification of the curriculum for a particular gifted student is implemented on the basis of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) which is recommended by the Education Counseling Service (NUV, 2016). An IEP is created for a gifted student who is identified as such between the 2nd and 4th grade of the “supportive measures”, which involve more significant changes in the curriculum (MŠMT, 2016c). The curriculum can also be differentiated without an IEP, but only within the 1st degree of the “supportive measure”, which includes only marginal changes in the curriculum and is not followed up to diagnostics in ECS. An IEP can be provided for all students with certified special education needs, including students with SENs. The IEP is parallel to the Individualized Learning Plan which is used in other countries (Ticha & col, 2018).

Curriculum for Gifted Students

For the purpose of respecting the specific educational needs of gifted students (as well as students with SENs) in terms of inclusive education, it is usually recommended to modify the curriculum in its content, process, product, environment and evaluation (Riley, 2011; Margot, 2020). Traditionally, curriculum modifications can be implemented at the level of internal or external differentiation (Greger et al., 2012; Rogalla, 2012).

Internal differentiation is typical of a pro-inclusive pedagogical strategy, which should form the basis of all differentiated activities (Gajewski, 2017). The aims of internal differentiation is described by Tomlinson (2017) as an approach in which teachers proactively modify curricula to address the diverse needs of individual students and small groups of students to maximize the learning opportunity for each student in a classroom. Rogalla (2012) adds that these students usually work in the same topic area and classroom as other learners, but on a broader scale. Internal differentiation is the full responsibility of each teacher who works with the inclusive class. This pedagogical approach prevails if the gifted student is included in the 1st degree of the supportive measure (MŠMT, 2016c).

According to Rogalla (2012), external differentiation means that the teacher or school creates different groups of students which work in different topic areas, mostly within different time periods. This may lead to groupings within the classroom as well as between-class groupings.

The Czech school curriculum also offers a number of flexible extracurricular activities for all students (VUP, 2007) which are comprised of extra lessons for individual students or whole school classes. Within extracurricular activities, the school can decide what topics and problems to address, as opposed to compulsory activities, the content of which is generally outlined in the school documents. According to the VUP (2007), the number of hours of extracurricular activities per week depends on the year of study and the focus of the school. Up to one-third of all classroom instruction may be used for extracurricular activities. Within

the “supportive measures” (MŠMT, 2016c) this time allocation may be extended up to 4 additional hours per week for the special individual development of students with SENs, including gifted students.

Further Education of Teachers in the Issue of Giftedness

Teachers in the Czech Republic themselves are obliged to participate in programs of further education to advance their professional development as a necessary part of teacher career advancement. Further education is accomplished by self-study projects as well as by studies at universities and other facilities for the continuing education of teachers (MŠMT, 2007). In 2019, 19.7% of all teachers participated in workshops concerned with issues of inclusive education (i.e., education of students with SENs and gifted students) in facilities for the further education of teachers (ČŠI, 2019). According to NIDV (2019b), only 0.6% of Czech teachers attended workshops especially on the topic of giftedness within inclusive education in 2019. This percentage has not changed over the last 4 years, although the numbers of teachers trained exclusively in secondary education were not available on the researched websites.

Upper Secondary Education for Gifted Students

Most gifted pupils are educated in inclusive elementary schools (i.e. ISCED 1 and 2 according to the International Standard Classification of Education 2011, which define the uniform classification system of education levels for states of UNESCO; see UNESCO, 2012). However, motivated academically gifted students from the age of 11 to 13 may select to engage in lower secondary education in grammar schools. When academically gifted students enter an ISCED 3 school to from an ISCED 2 institution, they are given the option of

studying at a lower secondary school which features certain attributes of selectiveness (ISCED 2B).

Upper secondary education in the Czech Republic (ISCED 3) is a differentiated system which includes secondary education completed with a final school leaving examination (ISCED 3A: secondary general schools, secondary technical schools and ISCED 3B: conservatories), as well as secondary education leading to an apprenticeship certificate, or general secondary education (ISCED 3C), see MŠMT (2016b). Motivated academically gifted students often select education ended by a school leaving examination in order to continue their studies at university. Within these schools, academically gifted students can decide for secondary general schools (SGS) or secondary technical schools (STS). SGS schools expand the objectives of general education and aim to prepare a student for any type of tertiary education. STS schools offer education with a professional focus (science, technology, or humanities). The graduates of STS schools can then decide whether to go directly into practice, since they have already acquired professional qualifications in their secondary school education, or to continue their studies at the tertiary level within their field.

Students with SENs can theoretically study at all types of upper secondary education, but it depends on the type of "disability". The condition is the completion of compulsory schooling for nine years, approximately from the age of six (MŠMT, 2016b). The presented study focuses on SGS and STS schools, ie schools suitable for motivated academically gifted students, within which it monitors the differences concerning selected criteria of inclusive education.

Methodology

As follows from the theoretical basis, inclusive education is primarily focused on students with SENs and gifted students in the Czech Republic. These students are formally

included in the supportive measures through which the quality and quantity of curriculum modification is proposed.

In our research, we focus on academically gifted students in upper secondary education. When transferring from ISCED 2 to ISCED 3, academically gifted students have the opportunity to develop their giftedness at two basic types of inclusive schools, namely secondary general schools (SGS) and secondary technical schools (STS). Our aim is to determine how the above mentioned schools evaluate the importance of selected criteria of inclusive education in pedagogical work with gifted students. We compare the state of the problematics of giftedness with the problematics of students with SENs. We also address the question of the difference between SGS and STS schools.

Aim of the Study

This study includes three primary research goals:

First goal: to find out the importance of fulfilling selected criteria of inclusive education of students with special educational needs (SENs) in secondary schools and to reveal differences in evaluation between secondary technical schools (STS) and secondary general schools (SGS).

Second goal: to find out the importance of fulfilling selected criteria of inclusive education of gifted students in secondary schools and to reveal differences in evaluation between secondary technical schools (STS) and secondary general schools (SGS).

Third goal: to find out how the answers of respondents who evaluated the criterion positively in the area of students with SENs and then also in the area of gifted students differed; and to find out how these responses differed from STS and SGS schools.

The Questionnaire and its Analysis

The P-KAP II questionnaire originates from the project P-KAP (see <http://www.nuv.cz/p-kap>), a venture was launched in 2016 aimed at supporting upper secondary education in the Czech Republic (ISCED 3). Methodological support is provided by the National Pedagogical Institute of the Czech Republic, an institution directly managed by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport.

The P-KAP II questionnaire is a multi-item survey divided into 10 main thematic sub-areas which correspond to the areas of support for secondary education in the Czech Republic. One of the sub-areas of the questionnaire (part F) is exclusively focused on the topic of inclusive education and contains 137 items. The questionnaire is still being evaluated because of the large number of the monitored data within the questionnaire.

In a thematic analysis of this part of the questionnaire, we have identified items that can summarize the quality of inclusive education of gifted students compared to the quality of inclusive education of students with SENs. We found a total of 9 quality criteria for inclusive education (i.e. 18 items), wherein in one context the criterion is related to the group of students with SENs and in the second context to gifted students. Based on the revealed items and criteria, our research objectives were specified.

The “importance”, which belongs to the content of the research goals, is predefined by types of items in the questionnaire. The items we worked with required answers according to the Likert Scale (“the criterion is for our school: very important - important - rather unimportant – unimportant”). The data matrix available has simplified the range of “yes” (very important + important) and “no” (rather unimportant – unimportant) responses, due to clarity of the data analysis. We also found that most responses resorted to the extreme possibilities (either very important or unimportant)

The questionnaire was distributed online to all upper secondary schools of the Czech Republic during October and November 2018. The questionnaire was always filled in once

for the whole school by a competent person from the school management (headmaster or deputy headmaster). The target group of school principals was chosen because the questionnaire contained, among other things, questions concerning the organization of the school, staffing, visions of schools, to which these persons are competent to answer.

According to the portal <http://www.seznamskol.eu>, there were overall 1442 upper secondary schools in the Czech Republic in 2018. The questionnaire was distributed to the 1364 schools mentioned above, all of which were involved in the P-KAP project. The response rate of completed questionnaires was 96%, with all regions of the Czech Republic participating. A total of 1293 upper secondary schools participated in the research (i.e. 87 % of all these schools in the Czech Republic participated in the questionnaire survey).

Regarding the objective of the research, we focused only on selected secondary schools suitable for the development of students' academic talents - secondary general schools (SGS) and secondary technical schools (STS), which belongs to ISCED 3A. A total of 1055 of these schools completed and returned the questionnaire. Based on further analysis, we found that these schools are in practice associated with other types of secondary schools (i.e. mixture of ISCED 3A, 3B and 3C). Since we aimed to determine differences in the evaluation of inclusive education between STS and SGS, we selected only those that are exclusively STS or SGS (i.e. those without links to another type of school). We finally worked with 541 schools, of which 291 were SGS and 250 STS.

The data were subjected to descriptive statistical analysis in IBM SPSS (version 25). The aim of the analysis was to determine what percentage of the schools (specifically SGS and STS) declared the importance of individual criteria of inclusive education as well as to trace the selected pairs of items regarding what percentage of schools offered them at the same time.

Criteria of Inclusive Education

The criteria of inclusive education were predefined by the construction of the questionnaire, ie. criteria were created by the author of this study explicitly. As the authors of the questionnaire refer to valid legislative documents, it is possible to assume that this is a selection from key criteria of Czech inclusive education.

The following criteria of inclusive education were monitored, with the first criterion concerning students with SENs and the second focusing on gifted students:

1. Teacher cooperation: teachers at the school cooperate to meet the special needs of students; teachers ... to support gifted students.
2. Extended SCS (school counselling services) at the school: the school has extended SCS to support students with SENs; ... to support gifted students.
3. FE (further education) of teachers: teachers participate in workshops within FE focused on the support of students with SENs; ... focused on the support of gifted students.
4. Pedagogical diagnostics: teachers use pedagogical diagnostics of students with SENs; they work with student portfolios; teachers ... with gifted students ...
5. Cooperation with ECS (education counselling services): teachers cooperate with ECS to support students with SENs; ... to support gifted students.
6. IEP (Individualized education program): the school prepares and evaluates IEPs for students with SENs; ...for gifted students.
7. Internal differentiation: teachers choose teaching strategies of internal differentiation according to the students' special educational needs; ... in the education of gifted students.
8. External differentiation: the school modifies the organization of teaching in accordance with the needs of students with SENs; ... with the needs of gifted students.

9. Extracurricular activities: the school offers extracurricular activities for students with SENs; ... for gifted students.

Results

The first research aim was to find out the importance of fulfilling selected criteria of inclusive education of students with special educational needs (SENs) in secondary schools as well as to reveal differences in evaluation between secondary technical schools (STS) and secondary general schools (SGS). The importance of fulfilling the selected criteria were indicated by the values “yes” (it’s important for us) and “no” (it’s not important for us).

The declared importance of inclusive education of students with SENs can be found in Table 1, columns a) and b), which distinguishes the answers for STS and SGS. We assume here that the answers “yes” should ideally be close to 100%, which would be the highest reported quality of all secondary schools. In terms of average answers for both types of secondary schools (average for STS and SCS), Table 2 lists the criteria scored from highest to lowest importance. The top 4 ranked criteria for both types of schools include “internal differentiation” (87.6%), “cooperation with ECS” (84.6%), “teacher cooperation” (72.9%), and “IEP” (69.4%). Criteria whose declared importance is very low include “extracurricular activities” (30.25%), “extended SCS at school” (26.1%) and “pedagogical diagnostics” (23.8%).

Table 1. The difference in inclusive education between STS and SGS schools and between students with SENs and gifted students.

		students with SENs			gifted students		
		STS	SGS	δ	STS	SGS	δ
column		a	b	c	d	e	f
1. Teacher cooperation	<i>N</i> No	66	81		118	101	
	%	26.4%	27.8%	1.4%	47.2%	34.7%	12.5%
	<i>N</i> Yes	184	210		132	190	
	%	73.6%	72.2%	1.4%	52.8%	65.3%	12.5%
<hr/>		<i>N</i> No	208	188	205	184	

2. Extended SCS at school	%	83.2%	64.6	18.6%	82%	63.3%	18.7%
	<i>N</i> Yes	42	103		45	107	
	%	16.8%	35.4%	18.6%	18%	36.7%	18.7%
3. FE of teachers	<i>N</i> No	90	68		233	263	
	%	36 %	23.4%	12.6%	93.2%	90.3%	2.9%
	<i>N</i> Yes	160	233		17	28	
	%	64%	76.6%	12.6%	6.8%	9.7%	2.9%
4. Pedagogical diagnostics	<i>N</i> No	186	227		196	202	
	%	74.4%	78%	3.6% (rev.)	78.4 %	69.4%	9%
	<i>N</i> Yes	64	64		54	89	
	%	25.6%	22%	3.6% (rev.)	21.6%	30.6%	9%
5. Cooperation with ECS	<i>N</i> No	42	41		185	139	
	%	16.8%	14.1%	2.7%	74%	47.8%	26.2%
	<i>N</i> Yes	208	250		65	152	
	%	83.2%	85.9%	2.7%	26%	52.2%	26.2%
6. IEP	<i>N</i> No	93	70		198	140	
	%	37.2%	24.1%	13.1%	79.2%	48.4%	30.8%
	<i>N</i> Yes	157	221		52	150	
	%	62.8%	75.9%	13.1%	20.8%	51.6%	30.8%
7. Internal differentiation	<i>N</i> No	31	36		142	141	
	%	12.4%	12.4%	0%	56.8%	48.4%	8.4%
	<i>N</i> Yes	219	255		108	168	
	%	87.6%	87.6%	0%	43.2%	51.6%	8.4%
8. External differentiation	<i>N</i> No	128	139		210	185	
	%	51.2%	47.8%	3.4%	84%	63.5%	20.5%
	<i>N</i> Yes	122	152		40	106	
	%	48.8%	52.2%	3.4%	16%	36.5%	20.5%
9. Extracurricular activities	<i>N</i> No	183	193		161	124	
	%	73.2%	66.3%	6.9%	64.4%	42.6%	21.8%
	<i>N</i> Yes	67	98		89	167	
	%	26.8%	33.7%	6.9%	35.6%	57.4%	21.8%

Let us focus on the differences in responses between school types (Table 1, difference between columns a) and b). SGS schools declared a higher importance of inclusive education of students with special educational needs (SENs) than did STS schools within all other criteria. The exception is the criterion “pedagogical diagnostics,” for which the difference between types of schools is minimal; the percentage difference between the STS and SGS school responses can be found in Table 1 and column c). The numbers in bold indicate the greatest differences within the criteria “extended SCS at school” (18.6%), “IEP” (13.1%), “FE

of teachers” (12.6%) and “extracurricular activities” (6.9%). For other criteria, the difference in responses was negligible.

Table 2. Average declared quality of inclusive education for both types of schools (STS and SGS) compared to students with SENs and gifted students (in accordance with students with SENs listed from the highest to lowest importance)

column	students with SENs	gifted students
	a)	b)
7. Internal differentiation	87.6%	47.4%
5. Cooperation with ECS	84.6%	39.1%
1. Teacher cooperation	72.9%	59.0%
3. FE of teachers	70.3%	8.25%
6. IEP	69.4%	36.2%
8. External differentiation	50.56%	26.3%
9. Extracurricular activities	30.25%	26.3%
2. Extended SCS at school	26.1%	27.35%
4. Pedagogical diagnostics	23.8%	26.1%

Concerning the second research aim, columns d) and e) of Table 1 describe the importance of fulfilling selected criteria of inclusive education with a focus on gifted students. The average responses for both types of schools (STS and SGS) are shown in Table 2 in column b). The highest rated criteria include “teacher cooperation” (59.0%), “internal differentiation” (47.4%), “cooperation with ECS” (39.1%) and “IEP” (36,2%). Only for 27-26% of schools were the following criteria important: “extended SCS at school” (27.35%), “external differentiation” (26.3%), “extracurricular activities” (26.3%) and “pedagogical diagnostics” (26.1%). “FE of teachers” (8.25%) seems to be marginal in relation to gifted students.

We provided average answers for both types of schools. Focusing on the specific difference between schools, we find that SGS always declared a more noticeably higher quality regarding inclusive education concerning gifted students. The differences are shown in Table 1, columns d) and e). We also reveal criteria for which the percentage difference is significant (see Table 1, column f): “IEP” (δ 30,8%), “cooperation with ECS” (δ 26.2%),

“extracurricular activities” (δ 21.8%), “external differentiation” (δ 20.5%), “extended SCS at school” (δ 18.7%) and “teacher cooperation” (δ 12.5%).

As far as the third research aim, Table 3, columns c) and d) presents the answers of respondents in the area of gifted students. The answers of respondents in the area of students with SENs (columns a and b) were included to improve the clarity of this data. Table 3 contains only selected answers which respondents answered positively, both in the area of students with SENs and in the area of gifted students.

The results in Table 3, columns c) and d), indicate that SGS schools reported a higher match of positive answers than did STS in most of the criteria in terms of both students with SENs and gifted students (i.e. for SGS, all percentages are significantly higher than for STS). The only criterion that proved marginal in SGS schools was, again, “pedagogical diagnostics.”

Other results indicate that certain criteria in the field of gifted students are significantly undersized compared to the field of students with SENs. Focusing on STS schools, the criteria of “extended SCS at school,” “FE of teachers,” “pedagogical diagnostics” and “external differentiation” were shown to be of very low importance (see columns c and d). That’s less than 10% of respondents who claimed to meet these criteria in the area of students with SENs also were shown to meet these criteria in the area of gifted students. Although two criteria, “teacher cooperation” and “internal differentiation” were for 40% of STS schools also considered important in the field of gifted education, this difference shows a significant underestimation of the area of gifted students in STS schools.

Table 3. Consent responses from respondents in the gifted students’ area (in contrast to students with SENs).

column	students with SENs		gifted students	
	STS		SGS	
	<i>N</i>	Yes	<i>N</i>	Yes
	%		%	
	<i>a)</i>	<i>b)</i>	<i>c)</i>	<i>d)</i>
1. Teacher cooperation	184	210	106	151
	73.6%	72.2%	42.4%	51.9%
2. Extended SCS at school	42	103	16	42
	16.8%	35.4%	6.4%	14.4%
3. FE of teachers:	160	233	14	18
	64%	76.6%	5.6%	6.2%
4. Pedagogical diagnostics	64	64	23	24
	25.6%	22%	9.2%	8.2%
5. Cooperation with ECS	208	250	57	138
	83.2%	85.9%	22.8%	47.4%
6. IEP	157	221	36	126
	62.8%	75.9%	14.4%	43.3%
7. Internal differentiation	219	255	102	170
	87.6%	87.6%	40.8%	58.4%
8. External differentiation	122	152	24	73
	48.8%	52.2%	9.6%	25.1%
9. Extracurricular activities	67	98	32	71
	26.8%	33.7%	12.8%	24.4%

The situation in SGS schools seems to be significantly better (see Table 3, column d). As with STS schools, SGS schools also aim to support the criteria of “teacher cooperation” and “internal differentiation,” but to a much greater extent. In the case of STS schools, the criteria “cooperation with ECS” and “IEP” were indicated, with about 45% of respondents declaring their importance in both thematic areas (students with SENs and gifted students). As with STS schools, SGS schools declared a very low importance regarding the criteria “FE of teachers” and “pedagogical diagnostics.”

Summary and Discussion

We found that schools declare a great interest in the issue of inclusive education of students with special educational needs (SENs). SGS schools declare a significantly higher importance of all criteria of inclusive education than do STS schools (first goal). In the context of gifted students, a significant decrease in interest was declared, where also SGS

schools declared higher importance of all criteria of inclusive education than do STS schools (second goal).

The results also indicate that SGS schools reported a higher match of positive answers (i.e. how the answers of respondents who evaluated the criterion positively in the area of students with SENs and then also of gifted students) than did STS in most of the criteria and indicate that certain criteria in the field of gifted students are significantly undersized compared to the field of students with SENs (third goal). This deepens the illustration that inclusive education in SGS schools and the education of students with SENs seems to be significantly better.

It is important to fully understand the specific context of our study before we move on to interpreting concrete results. The theoretical background shows that inclusive education takes the form of traditional integration (i.e. primary focus on the learner's differences and his/her separation within the integrative class). In practice, conditions for an inclusive school, such as incorporating the concept of "school for all" are rather suppressed. Some authors (Ponte & Smit, 2016; Hodkinson & Vickerman, 2016; Skidmore, 2004) highlight the substitution of the concept of inclusion with the concept of integration in pedagogical practice. Other definitions of inclusive education maintain that inclusion can be referred to as the highest degree of integration (Vislie, 2010), in which the ascertained condition can be described as one of the early stages of inclusive education. However, according to the above-mentioned sources, the state of inclusive education in the Czech Republic should not be seen as unique on a global scale.

In describing the preference of interest in the problematics of students with SENs over gifted students, it is necessary to realize the wider context in which our research should be viewed. The early stages of establishing the issue of giftedness in school legislation date back to the beginning of this century, while the legislation dealing with the issue of pupils with

SEN had already been anchored primarily throughout the last century. The issue of giftedness may, therefore, still be perceived as one to be dealt with only after more important matters have been settled, or even an elitist concern. The marginalization of the problem of giftedness is clearly reflected in the low number of teachers who attended workshops on the topic of giftedness as well as in the low number of officially identified gifted students. Low interest in these problematics may be the consequence of received informal concepts of giftedness, according to which the gifted individual is one with no problems regarding education (Machů, 2019), an attitude which can reduce the motivation of teachers to deal with this issue.

Inclusive Education of Students with SENs

Concerning the concrete results of the study, all the secondary schools declared a relatively high interest in the issue of inclusive education in relation to students with SENs. It is therefore positive that prioritizing the issue of students with SENs across the school system is directly reflected in teaching practice.

Regarding the criteria of inclusive education, schools consider “cooperation with ECS” and creating an “IEP” very important. In our opinion, this situation is influenced by the fact that schools are obliged to take into account the fact that a student has special educational needs during the admission procedure for upper secondary education. The student is required to submit an official statement from ECS diagnostics. Upon admission of this student to the school, the cooperation with ECS services logically continues.

Schools were shown to prefer the criterion “further education of teachers” in the topic of students with SENs. Due to the relatively high number of trained teachers in this area along with the increase in the number of students with SENs, the result could be expected. We found that the criterion of “internal differentiation” and “teacher cooperation” is important for schools. These are strategies that are basic pedagogical competencies and do not require any

significant formal changes in the organization of the school. The question is then what is the real quality of this activity in practice.

On the contrary, criteria to which schools do not attach great importance include “extracurricular activities,” “extended SCS at school” and “pedagogical diagnostics.” As far as the first two criteria, formal interventions in the organization of each school would be needed. Regarding “pedagogical diagnostics,” it is warranted that this competence be delegated to an external services ECS.

Summarizing the status of inclusive education of students with SENs, the schools declared a low level of formal school conception; they turn to external school services and indicated a preference for informal differentiation of the curriculum rather than the differentiation that would be created formally at their school.

Inclusive Education of Gifted Students

If we focus exclusively on the monitored criteria of inclusive education concerning gifted students, we find that all the monitored schools declared a significantly more limited interest in gifted students compared to students with SENs. This is an interesting result, especially in connection with the fact that SGS and STS schools are the only study option for motivated cognitively gifted students who want to continue in tertiary education.

To be more specific, if the criteria of inclusive education in the field of gifted students were partially favored (internal differentiation, cooperation with ECS, teacher cooperation), the preference generally coincided with the criteria that were more strongly preferred regarding students with SENs. These results again point to the cooperation with ECS, which results in the creation of IEPs. Furthermore, it is a partial predilection for the criteria “internal differentiation” and “teacher cooperation” which may again indicate the preference for non-formalized strategies of curriculum differentiation. It should be stressed

that the inclination toward the criterion “FE (further education) of teachers” shifted from very important concerning students with SENs to a completely marginal place concerning gifted students. With the officially reported low numbers of teachers trained in gifted education, this result is logical.

If we summarize the situation within the problematic of gifted students, we reach a similar conclusion as in the case of students with SENs. Indications include a low formal concept of gifted individuals in schools, schools turning to external school services, a preference for informal differentiation of curriculum over differentiation, which would have to be formally defined at the school. Compared to the schools’ interest in students with SENs, the interest in gifted students is very low.

Secondary general schools (SGS) versus Secondary technical schools (STS)

We also focused on comparisons between SGS and STS schools. Given the practical focus of STS schools, we would assume that they would place greater importance on the criteria of “external differentiation” and “extracurricular activities” in which the implementation of their learning activities should take place. STS schools, however, declared less importance for all the monitored criteria.

The higher interest of SGS schools concerning the problematics of gifted students is expected, as these students receive targeted general education preparing them for university studies, and we can assume a certain natural selection of gifted students. Our results show that SGS schools are trying to establish a targeted concept for the care of gifted students at school, and increasingly for students with SENs. Within their inclusive education, they declared an interest in “extracurricular activities” and “external differentiation” for gifted students, which should be competencies anchored by an extended school counseling service. The good quality

of care for gifted students in SGS schools is also evidenced by an in-depth survey of the Czech School Inspectorate (2019).

In the monitored data we also try to determine how the answers of the respondents who evaluated the criterion positively for both students with SENs and gifted students differed. Further, we sought to determine how these responses differed from STS and SGS schools. Using this comparison, in our evaluations of the individual answers of respondents we attempted to reach a deeper level of analysis highlighting even more the differences regarding the preference of selected criteria between STS and SGS, as well as the issue of gifted students and students with SENs.

Research Limitations

We realize that the results could have been predefined by the context of the educational system in general, which can be seen to prefer students with SENs over gifted students, see theoretical background: tradition in the care of students with SENs, number of diagnosed students with SENs, further teacher education, school legislation, construction of the P-KAP II questionnaire, etc.

We applied only selected criteria defining inclusive education in our research process, recognizing early on that this restricted selection certainly could not encompass all aspects of inclusive systems.

Our research sought to measure and evaluate the perceived importance of the selected criteria of inclusive education. The results represent only a declared degree of importance, which may have nothing to do with real school practice. It is also necessary to consider that the results were provided by headmasters who completed the questionnaire (i.e. the situation as seen through their perspective).

We used data obtained using the P-KAP II questionnaire, an instrument managed by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport. We believe that the directors and assistants approached the questionnaire very responsibly, despite the fact that it was very extensive. Although the questionnaire was anonymized, we think that the respondents could not help but to attempt to place their school in the best possible light. Therefore, we believe that the research evaluations are overvalued in comparison to the unadulterated reality of inclusive education.

On the other hand, one clear value of the study is the very large number of schools that participated in the questionnaire survey. The results of the study within the above context and methodology can thus easily be extrapolated to all SGS and STS schools in the Czech Republic.

Conclusion

Although the problematics of dealing with gifted students is an educational priority in the Czech Republic, both the theoretical background and research conclusions clearly show that the issue remains marginalized. Comparing this result to the situation of the problematics of students with SENs, the very low motivation of schools to deal with problems of the gifted is highlighted.

The results of our study suggest that schools tend to deal with gifted students with the same mindset and methods as they do with students with SENs. The effectiveness of this approach is debatable, especially as the inclusive education of students with SENs is conceived within a traditional integration framework.

Schools rely excessively on external counseling services to identify gifted individuals but also to set up curriculum modification plans. Schools prefer informal inclusive pedagogical practices to formal strategies in developing their gifted students. We found,

therefore, that institutions lack their own school concept of caring for gifted individuals. The Czech school legislation (MŠMT, 2014) proposes the possibility of establishing a position of School Counselor for Gifted Students within the framework of school counseling services. Establishing a position is currently optional for schools. The numbers of schools in the Czech Republic where with this expert are not ascertained yet. According to our estimate, their number is completely negligible (in the order of tens). We believe that the establishment of this position would be a suitable solution for improving the school concept of caring for gifted individuals. In our opinion, further training courses should be set up for these professionals, which would gradually deepen their knowledge and practical skills in the field of giftedness. It should certainly not be a matter of mass participation in courses without systematic follow-up. Through this professional specialist competences gradually move the school culture toward greater inclusiveness.

We also find that secondary general schools (SGS) are preferable to secondary technical schools (STS) in terms of the care of gifted students as well as students with SENs. SGS schools always declare better conditions for the development of these students. By the key priority of inclusive education as a "school for all", it is necessary to include these priorities into the concepts of all educational institutions.

The article tried to describe the importance of supporting giftedness, which is among the priorities of the educational policy of the Czech Republic. The research pointed out a significant discrepancy between formal (legislative) and real practical support of gifted students. In addition, we emphasized the marginalization of practical care of giftedness by comparing the issues of gifted students to students with SENs. In addition, we focused on the environment of secondary general schools, which is according to the theoretical background most appropriate for academically gifted students within the secondary school system. The results of the research aim to draw attention to this problem and serve as a theoretical anchor

for the issue of possible follow-up practical projects supporting the education of gifted students, not only in the Czech Republic.

Acknowledgements

This paper was supported by the project FSR-ST-2020/006 "Preparation and operation of the Education Support Centre" funded by the Faculty of Humanities, Tomas Bata University in Zlin.

Reference List

- Altintas, E., & Ilgun, S. (2016). The term “gifted child“ from teachers’ view. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 11(10), 957 – 965. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2016.2762>
- Balaban Cakirpaloglu, I., Odstrčilová, J., Musilová I., & Bařinková, Z. (2019). Společné vzdělávání pohledem ředitelů škol a školských zařízení zapojených do projektu APIV B (Inclusion from the point of view of school principals and school facilities involved in the APIV project). *Sociální pedagogika / Social Education* 7(2), 17–31. <https://doi.org/10.7441/soced.2019.07.02.01>
- Carman, C. A. (2013). Comparing apples and oranges: Fifteen years of definitions of giftedness in research. *Journal of Advanced Academics*. 24(1), 52-70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1932202X12472602>
- ČŠI. (2015). *Výroční zpráva České školní inspekce za školní rok 2014/2015* (Annual report of the Czech school inspectorate for the school year 2014/2015). [https://www.csicr.cz/cz/Dokumenty/Vyrocnizpravy/Vyrocnizprava-Ceske-skolni-inspekce-za-skolni-\(1\)](https://www.csicr.cz/cz/Dokumenty/Vyrocnizpravy/Vyrocnizprava-Ceske-skolni-inspekce-za-skolni-(1))

- ČŠI. (2017). *Společné vzdělávání ve školním roce 2016/2017* (Inclusion in the school year 2016/2017). <https://www.csicr.cz/getattachment/2a015a62-beeb-489e-8150-e0e4cd3959b3/Shrnuti-Spolecne-vzdelavani-ve-skolnim-roce-2016-2017.pdf>
- ČŠI. (2018). *Tematická zpráva - vybrané aspekty implementace společného vzdělávání* (Thematic report - selected aspects of the implementation of inclusion). <https://www.csicr.cz/cz/Dokumenty/Tematicke-zpravy/Vybrane-aspekty-implementace-spolecneho-vzdelavani>
- ČŠI. (2019). *Kvalita a efektivita vzdělávání a vzdělávací soustavy ve školním roce 2018/2019* (Quality and efficiency of education and the education system in the school year 2018/2019). [https://www.csicr.cz/cz/Dokumenty/Vyrocnizpravy/Kvalita-a-efektivita-vzdelavani-a-vzdelavaci-s-\(2\)](https://www.csicr.cz/cz/Dokumenty/Vyrocnizpravy/Kvalita-a-efektivita-vzdelavani-a-vzdelavaci-s-(2))
- Culross R. R. (1997). Concepts of inclusion in gifted education. *Teaching exceptional children*, 29(3), 24-26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004005999702900304>
- Delisle, J. R. (2001). In praise of elitism. *Gifted Child Today*, 24(1), 14 -15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107621750102400305>
- Donnelly, J., & Watkins, A. (2012). *Teacher Education for inclusion in Europe. Challenges and opportunities*. Routledge.
- Eleweke, J.C., & Rodda, M. (2002). The challenge of enhancing inclusive education in developing countries. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 6(2), 113-126, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110110067190>
- Farrel, P., & Ainscow, M. (2002). *Making special education inclusive*. David Fulton Publishers.
- Gagné, F. (2018). Attitudes toward gifted education: Retrospective and prospective update. *Psychological Test and Assessment Modeling*, 60(1), 403-428. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332276.2000.11672939>.

- Gajewski, A. (2017). Conceptualizing professional ethics in inclusive education. In A. Gajewski (Ed.), *Ethics, equity, and Inclusive Education* (pp 1-22). Emerald.
- Greger D., Levínská M., & Smetáčková I. (2012). Priority education policies in the Czech republic: Redesigning equity policies in the post-communist transformation. In M. Demeuse, D. Frandji, D. Greger, & J. Rochex (Eds.), *Educational Policies and Inequalities in Europe* (pp 191-219). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hodkinson, A. Vickerman, P. (2016). Inclusion: defining definitions. In Brown, Z. (Ed.), *Inclusive Education: Perspectives on pedagogy, policy and practice* (pp7 -13). Routledge.
- IPPP (2004). *Koncepce péče o nadané žáky ve školských poradenských zařízeních pro období 2004 - 2008. (Concept of care for gifted pupils at education counseling facilities for the period 2004 - 2008).*
http://www.ippp.cz/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=179&Itemid=264
- Jahnukainen, M. (2015). Inclusion, integration, or what? A comparative study of the school principals' perceptions of inclusive and special education in Finland and in Alberta, Canada. *Disability & Society*, 30(1), 59-72.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2014.982788>
- Kryszewska, H. (2017). Teaching students with special needs in inclusive classrooms. *ELT Journal*, 71(4), 525-528. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx042>
- Machů, E. (2019). Nadaný žák je jako Jágr mezi hokejisty, aneb učitelova koncepce nadání v analýze metaphor (Gifted pupil is as a Jágr between hockey players: Teachers' conception of giftedness in metaphor analysis). *Studia paedagogica*, 24(3), 77 - 92.
<https://doi.org/10.5817/SP2019-3-3>

- Margot, K. C. (2020). *Gifted education and gifted students: A Guide for inservice and preservice teachers*. Prufrock press.
- McBee M. T., & Makel, M. C. (2019). The quantitative implications of definitions of giftedness. *AERA Open*, 5(1), 1 – 13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858419831007>
- Michalík, J., Baslerová, P., & Růžička, M. & col. (2018). *Postoje pedagogických pracovníků k vybraným aspektům společného vzdělávání* (Attitudes of pedagogical staff to selected aspects of inclusive education). UPOL.
- Miller, E. M. (2009). The effect of training in gifted education on elementary classroom teachers' theory-based reasoning about the concept of giftedness. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 33(1), 65 - 105. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016235320903300104>
- Montgomery, D. (2015). *Teaching gifted children with special educational needs: Supporting dual and multiple exceptionality*. Routledge.
- MŠMT. (2020). *The education of pupils with special educational needs*.
<http://www.msmt.cz/areas-of-work/social-programs/the-education-of-pupils-with-special-educational-needs?lang=2>
- MŠMT. (2001). *National programme for the development of education in the Czech republic*.
White paper. http://www.msmt.cz/uploads/VKav_200/Bila_Kniha_2001/whitepaper.pdf
- MŠMT. (2004). *Education act on pre-primary, basic, secondary and tertiary professional education (No. 561)*. <http://www.msmt.cz/documents-1/act-no-561-2004-collection-of-law-on-pre-school-basic-secondary-tertiary-professional-and-other-education-the-education-act-as-amended?lang=2>
- MŠMT. (2007). *The strategy of lifelong learning in the CR*.
https://www.msmt.cz/uploads/Strategy_LLL_eng_final.pdf
- MŠMT. (2014). *Koncepce podpory rozvoje nadání a péče o nadané na období let 2014 – 2020* (Concept of support the giftedness and care for the gifted for the period 2014 – 2020).

file:///C:/Users/Eva/Downloads/Koncepce%20podpory_rozvoje_nadani_2014-2020%20(9).pdf

MŠMT. (2016a). *Strategy for education policy of the Czech republic until 2020.*

http://www.vzdelavani2020.cz/images_obsah/dokumenty/strategy_web_en.pdf

MŠMT. (2016b). *The education system in the Czech republic.*

<http://www.msmt.cz/mezinarodni-vztahy/the-education-system-in-the-czech-republic-1>

MŠMT. (2016c). *Stručný přehled vybraných podpůrných opatření vhodných pro rozvoj*

nadání žáků základních škol a gymnázií (A brief overview of selected supportive

measures suitable for the development of the talents of primary school and grammar

school pupils). http://www.msmt.cz/file/39174_1_1/

NIDV. (2019a). *Prioritní témata (Priority topics).* <https://www.nidv.cz/prioritni-temata>

NIDV. (2019b). *Výroční zpráva 2019 (Annual Report 2019).* [https://www.nidv.cz/o-](https://www.nidv.cz/o-nas/vyrocni-zpravy)

[nas/vyrocni-zpravy](https://www.nidv.cz/o-nas/vyrocni-zpravy)

NUV. (2015). *National Curricula.* <http://www.nuv.cz/our-work/framework>

NUV. (2016). *School and education counselling services.* [http://www.nuv.cz/our-](http://www.nuv.cz/our-work/counselling)

[work/counselling](http://www.nuv.cz/our-work/counselling)

NUV. (2020). *Národní projekty (National projects).* [http://www.nuv.cz/projekty/narodni-](http://www.nuv.cz/projekty/narodni-projekty?lang=1)

[projekty?lang=1](http://www.nuv.cz/projekty/narodni-projekty?lang=1)

Olthouse, J. (2014). How do preservice teachers conceptualize giftedness? A metaphor

analysis. *RoeperReview*, 36(2), 122-132.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2014.884200>

OSF. (2017). *Dopady reformy společného vzdělávání v České republice (Impacts of the*

inclusive education reform in the Czech republic). [https://osf.cz/wp-](https://osf.cz/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/DOPADY_REFORMY_SPOLECNEHO_VZDELAVANI_V_CR.pdf)

[content/uploads/2017/11/DOPADY_REFORMY_SPOLECNEHO_VZDELAVANI_V_](https://osf.cz/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/DOPADY_REFORMY_SPOLECNEHO_VZDELAVANI_V_CR.pdf)

[CR.pdf](https://osf.cz/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/DOPADY_REFORMY_SPOLECNEHO_VZDELAVANI_V_CR.pdf)

- Ponte, P., & Smit, B. H. J. (2016). Education for all as praxis: Consequences for the profession. In J. Wilkinson, L. Bristol, & P. Ponte (Eds), *Profesional Development: Education for All as praxis*. (5 - 19). Routledge.
- Perkovic Krijan, I., & Boric, E. (2014). Teachers' attitudes towards gifted students and differences in attitudes regarding the years of teaching. *Croatian Journal of Education*, 17(1), 165-178. <https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v17i0.1490>
- Riley, T. L. (2011). *Teaching gifted students in the inclusive classroom*. Prufrock.
- Rogalla, M. (2012). Natural differentiation to challenge high ability students in the regular classroom. In A. Ziegler, Ch. Fischer, H. Stoeger & M. Reutlinger (Eds.), *Gifted Education as a Lifelong Challenge* (pp141 – 154). Verlag.
- Skidmore, D. (2004). *Inclusion: the dynamic of school development*. Open University Press.
- Syafril, S., Yaumas, N. E., Ishak, N. M., Yusof, R., Jaafar, A., Yunus, M. M., & Sugiharta, I. (2020). Characteristics and educational needs of gifted young scientists: a focus group study. *Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists*, 8(2), 947-954. <https://doi.org/10.17478/jegys.691713>
- The Salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs education*. (1994). <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000098427>
- Ticha, R., Abery, B., Johnstone, C., Poghosyan, A., & Hunt, P. (2018). *Inclusive education strategies: A textbook*. Regents of the University of Minnesota.
- Tirri, K., & Laine, S. (2017). Ethical challenges in inclusive education: The case of gifted students. In K. Tirri, & S. Laine, *Ethics, equity, and inclusive education* (pp 239-257). Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2013). Differentiated instruction. In C. M. Callahan & H. L. Herberg-Davis (Eds.), *Fundamentals of gifted education, considering multiple perspectives* (pp 287 - 300). Routledge.

- Tomlinson, C.A. (2017). *How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms*. USA: ASCD.
- UNESCO. (2000). *The Dakar framework for action*.
<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000121147>
- UNESCO. (2009). *Policy guidelines on inclusion in education*.
<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000177849>
- UNESCO. (2012). *International standard classification of education ISCED 2011*.
<http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/international-standard-classification-of-education-isced-2011-en.pdf>
- UNICEF. (1990). *Convention on the rights of the child*.
<https://www.unicef.org/sites/default/files/2019-04/UN-Convention-Rights-Child-text.pdf>
- Van-Tassel Baska, J., & Baska, A. (2019). *Curriculum planning and instructional design for gifted learners*. Prufrock Press.
- Vislie, L. (2010). From integration to inclusion: focusing global trends and changes in the western European societies. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 18(1), 17-35. <https://doi.org/0.1080/0885625082000042294>
- VUP. (2007). *Framework educational programme for general secondary education*.
<http://www.msmt.cz/areas-of-work/basic-education-1>
- Wang, Y. (2014). *Education policy reform trends in G20 members*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Winzer, M. A. (2009). *From integration to inclusion: a history of special education in the 20th*. Gallaudet University Press.

Author Biography

Mgr. Eva Klimecká, Ph.D. is a pedagogue and research fellow at the Research Centre of the Faculty of Humanities, TBU in Zlin, where she carries out research and projects in the field of gifted education. She also works as the Giftedness Support Coordinator of Zlin Region, which is a position managed by The National pedagogical institute of the Czech Republic. She is active member of ECHA – European Council for High Ability. She is the author of several research articles on gifted education (see ORCID 0000-0001-8732-0231).

Correspondence author: Research Centre of Faculty of Humanities, Faculty of Humanities, Tomas Bata University in Zlin, Štefánikova 5760, 76001 Zlín, The Czech Republic. Email: klimecka@utb.cz.